COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XVI. No. 16.] LONDON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1809. [Price 1s.

THE JUBILEE.

To RICHARD GOODLAD, ESQ.

OF THE

Parish of Droxford, in the County of Hants.

SIR, *Botley*, 19 *Oct.* 1809.

When I had, on the 17th instant, the pleasure of seeing you at the Justice-meeting at Droxford, you mentioned to me something about a subscription in behalf of the poor inhabitants of that parish, which has so long experienced the good effects of your activity and benevolence. You informed me, at the same time, that Mr. CHIDELL, the Overseer of the poor, in our Tything, would call upon me with a paper, containing a list of the subscriptions already taken. This paper, with *my name* on it, has just been presented to me; and, against my name, I have written these words: "*Mr. Cobbett thinks it improper to "give any thing at all;*" my reasons for which opinion I shall now state to you, and (under an address to you) to the public at large; because I am satisfied, that, in more than one point of view, the statement may, sooner or later, be conducive to the public good; and, as to the mode of address, it will, I think, require no apology, when it is considered, that the aforementioned Subscription-paper came accompanied with a circular-letter under your hand.

Of this letter, Sir, which I kept in my possession until I had read it twice through, the following is the substance: *That, on the 25th instant, being the day when the king will enter upon the 50th year of his reign, there will be a* GENERAL *rejoicing through the kingdom;——that it would be a* PITY, *that, amidst this general joy, the parish of Droxford should* APPEAR LESS LOYAL *than its neighbours;——that* MR. GARNIER *the Rector, and* MR. NOTT, *the Curate, together with other gentlemen of the parish, assembled after divine service, on Sunday last, proposed the opening of a Subscription for the purpose of raising a sum of money, wherewith to purchase bread, meat, and beer, to be delivered, on the 25th instant, to the poor parishioners of Droxford, it being the opinion of the parties so proposing, that the king would be peculiarly delighted with our loyalty's shewing itself in the form of largesses to his poorer subjects.*

These, Sir, are the principal propositions contained in your letter; and, before I come to consider them in their relation to what is called the Jubilee; before I come to consider them as relating solely to the present occasion, give me leave to trouble you with some observations upon all Subscriptions, having such an object in view, and being set on foot in such a manner.

First, then, I decidedly disapprove of this manner of *feeding* and *treating* the poor, which, so far from being conformable to the principles of *hospitality*, it does, in fact, argue, in the donors, a contempt for the persons fed and treated, who are thus as clearly marked out for a degraded cast, as if they had badges put upon their clothes, or, as some of the American negroes have, a burnt mark in their cheek. When, therefore, I treat a poor man, I treat him under my own roof, or, in case of sickness, send what I have to give him, to his own house, and never expose him to the humiliation of this kind of public and pauper-like relief. Besides, Sir, I hold it to be very injurious to the country, that any attempt like this should be made to keep pauperism in countenance; for such will be the tendency, though certainly not the *intention*, of the proposed largess. It must, in my opinion, as far as it operates, have the effect of reconciling the minds of the labouring people to a state of dependance and beggary, and to efface the small remains of that spirit, which formerly withheld their names from the list of paupers. I hold, Sir, that it is a terrible evil, that a labourer not afflicted with *illness* of any sort, either in himself or his family, should be under the necessity of applying for parish relief, should be under the necessity of begging any part of his bread, or of receiving any assistance in the character of either beggar or pauper; and, of course, I must disapprove of any project the object of which is to feed and treat any portion of our neighbours in that

character. But, adverting here, for a moment, to the particular case before us, there is this additional objection to the proposed largess, that I cannot help considering it as a sort of premium for hypocrisy, fitted to this especial occasion, though certainly not so considered by you or the Rector or Curate. For, either it must be meant, that the people thus fed and treated, do entertain *some sentiments* respecting the 50th anniversary of his majesty's accession, or that they care nothing at all about it: if the latter be the case, then are they induced, by the proposed treating, to express joy which they do not feel; and, in the former case, their sentiments must perfectly correspond with yours, or they are guilty of a still more detestable species of hypocrisy. The poor should, like the rich, be left to rejoice where they see *occasion* for joy. Men may meet together for such a purpose; but, then, to avoid the charge of hypocrisy, they must meet and feast at their own expence. Who, for instance, does not despise the plaudits of a drenched rabble at an election, except the wretch who is mean enough, for his own selfish purposes, to purchase muddy beer, wherewith to drench the said rabble? Do the purchased shouts of a drunken crowd, do honour to the candidate in whose behalf they are uttered? Your answer must be in the negative; and, yet, Sir, I think you will find it difficult to make out a clear distinction between the character of those shouts, and the shouts, which the beer you propose to give, will purchase in behalf of our sovereign. After all, however, the great objection that I have to this species of treating in general, is, that *it encourages pauperism;* it keeps pauperism in countenance: it nourishes that, which I wish to see checked, and which, as far as I am able, I keep down. The *labourer* is worthy of his hire; and, if he and his family be in health, shame on the employer if the labourer can call himself a pauper, or can think it becoming his character to be fed and treated through the means of a parochial subscription, and, whatever may be his feelings, put on the face of joy for the sake of a meal of bread, meat, and beer. Good God, Sir! am I told by you, that a meal of good victuals and drink, is a *rarity* amongst the labourers in the parish of Droxford? No: in so many words I am not thus told; but, what am I to think of their situation, when I am called upon, as a proof of my *loyalty*, to contribute towards the purchasing of one meal in fifty years for the labourers of that parish? *My* labourers, Sir, stand in no need of any such largess; they have, *from me*, the means of purchasing bread, meat, and beer, every day of their lives; no parish officer ever sees their face; they are not slaves, but as free as I am myself; if they see cause for *rejoicing* on the 25th instant, they will do it, if not they will let it alone, and the probability is, that they will, on that day, earn bread, meat, and beer for the next. If all labourers were in this situation, we should have no occasion for subscriptions for the purpose of feeding the *poor;* and, indeed, that degrading appellation, under which all the *labourers* are now-a-days included, would soon bear a different meaning.

Now, Sir, as to *the manner of setting on foot this Subscription*, unconnected with the particular occasion, I have a very great objection. The *name*, I perceive, of *every* person whom you expect to subscribe, in each Tything of the parish, *is put down upon the Subscription paper*, and in this state the paper is handed to him. So that, if he does not think proper to give his money away upon your recommendation, his *name* is to stand upon the list, with a *blank* against it, which blank does, in that case, amount to a positive *refusal*, to assist in feeding and making glad the heart of the poor. A very good judge of human nature and of the moral duties of man has observed, that "the *recommendations* of "superiors savour strongly of *commands*;" and, Sir, when I consider the weight, which your fortune, and especially your office of acting Justice of the Peace (the only one in the parish) necessarily give you, I must beg you to excuse me if I apply this observation to your present recommendation, which, I think, I am completely justified in doing, seeing that you have sent round our names, ready written upon the subscription list; an act so offensively presumptuous (though, I am sure, it was not so intended) that, had I been ever so much disposed to subscribe, I should not have done it, without protesting against the exercise of such manifest dictation. The truth, is, that habit, powerful in every walk of life, is peculiarly so with persons entrusted with public authority of any sort or degree; and, upon this occasion, you really do appear to me to have forgotten, that, when writing your circular letter, you were not upon the Bench, where your office frequently makes it your duty to dic-

ate, but which office gives you no right whatever to issue dictatorial recommendations to any persons whatever, for subscriptions of money, and especially to order the collection to be made by the overseers of the poor, or other parish-officers, or persons usually employed by the parish to collect its rates. Under such circumstances, Sir, it is in vain, it is quite idle, to call the subscription *voluntary*. With yourself, and with the other gentlemen, with whom the thing originated, the contribution is, of course, a voluntary act, and you have all, doubtless, your reasons for what you have done; but, with the *farmers* of the parish, with those who *cannot* be insensible to the weight of your recommendation, and whom you must be pretty sure would not send back your paper with a blank against their names; with these persons, is there any candid man will say, that the act of subscribing could possibly be voluntary?

These objections are *general*: they apply to all Subscriptions called for with a view of feeding, or treating, the poor; and also, to all subscriptions, for whatever purpose, set on foot in such a manner. But, Sir, upon the supposition, that subscriptions for feeding and treating the poor, may, in certain cases, be proper; and, upon the further supposition, that there are cases to justify the manner, in which this subscription has been set on foot, I have, in this case, an objection to the thing *on account of the occasion*; I object to the *principle* of your proposition; and, because I think it may be useful to the public, because I think it may tend to produce, or increase, a right way of thinking upon this and other political subjects, I shall here state the reasons, upon which my objection is principally founded.

The 25th of this month is, it seems, considered, by some persons, at least, as a day for the expressing of national joy; that it is, in short, to be a day of *Jubilee*, that is to say, of *rejoicing* and all sorts of *merriment* and signs of *gladness*; and it is to be so, for what? Why, it seems, *because*, upon that day, *the king enters upon the fiftieth year of his reign*. Now, Sir, if I had no other objection to your proposition than that which is founded upon the *nature of the occasion*, if its general principle, and *if its manner*, were such as I *approved* of; and, if the Jubilee were *expressly* stated to be merely a mark of *personal respect towards his Majesty*, under whose reign I was born, I should very willingly have joined your subscription; but, Sir, so far from this being the case, so far from its being expressly declared, that the Jubilee is to be regarded as a mark of personal respect towards the king, it is perfectly notorious, that, with those individuals who have taken the lead in the thing, and who, indeed, first set it on foot, the object is any thing but that which I have described, and, that one of the main purposes is, in this indirect manner to obtain what will be construed into *a general approbation of all the ministerial measures of this long and unfortunate reign*; rather than aid in effecting which purpose, I shall certainly run the risk of exposing myself to your implied charge of *disloyalty*, of the justice and decency of which charge I will speak more particularly by-and-by.

But, let us inquire a little closer into this subject of rejoicing. You call upon me to rejoice on the 50th anniversary of the King's accession to the throne. Now, even viewing the matter in the best possible light; even supposing, that you wish the Jubilee to be held with reference to the king solely, to the king personally; *why* would you have me rejoice at *this time* in particular? You certainly would not call upon us, your neighbours, to express our joy *that 49 years of the king's reign are already past*; to clap our hands and to shout because he has passed nine years beyond the age of man; to sing and dance and drink for joy, because the king is very old; to be full of joy, to overflow with gladness, in short, because the king has attained to an age, which, according to the course of nature, *must render the remainder of his reign of but short duration*. No: it certainly is not at *this* that you call upon us to rejoice. But, at what, then, would you have us rejoice? If not at the *old age* of the king, which is just the same thing as the mere *length of reign*; if not at this, you must then wish us to rejoice at and to celebrate *the changes and events of his reign*, and, in this way, to express our gratitude for the good which the nation has derived from those changes and events. Let us, therefore, see whether those changes and events are such as call upon us for expressions of joy and gratitude.

When the King mounted the throne, the DEBT, of which the nation pays the interest in taxes, amounted to about 90 millions; it now amounts to nearly 700 millions; and, one year's taxes now is nearly equal to what the whole Debt then was. The Poor Rates of England and

Wales then amounted to about *a million and a quarter* annually; they now amount to *more than six millions* annually. The number of parish paupers was then about *two hundred thousand;* that number is now above *twelve hundred thousand.* These are pretty good proofs, Sir, that we have no cause to rejoice at the changes of this reign. But, Sir, there is one, which will be very pat to your purpose, when you have the poor labourers of Droxford Parish assembled on the Jubilee-day; and that is, that, when this reign began, it cost the labouring man *five day's* work to earn a bushel of flour, and that now it costs him *ten day's* work to earn a bushel of flour; and that, if he happens to have three children, it is, upon the common run of wages, utterly impossible for him to earn bread enough for his family to eat, to say nothing of meat, drink, clothing, fire and house-rent. Pray, Sir, state this fact to the young ones: the old ones will not need be told of it. State this fact to them, and if they do not rejoice it is very strange indeed.——Then, Sir, if you should have some politicians in the higher seats of the festival, you may entertain them with the history of the last fifty year's glories, in diplomacy and in war. You may relate to them how we lost the continent of America for *the sake of a tax;* and how, for the *sake of other taxes* and of *corruption*, we got possession of vast countries in the East, through the means of which countries enterprizing young men, with scarcely a second shirt to their backs, and with a not much greater stock of ideas, contrive so to draw upon the taxes raised in England as to oust from their estates those, by whom the said taxes have been paid.——From these topics you may diverge into matters of a warlike nature: you may remind the "loyal" audience of the capture of a whole British army at *Saratoga*, and of another at *York town*. *Dunkirk* and the *Helder* will, of course, become the theme of your praise, after which, in due place, will follow *Ferrol, Buenos Ayres, Cairo, Cintra, Corunna, Talavera* and *Walcheren*. You will, then, doubtless, attempt an enumeration of those who have been slain during the *thirty years of war*, with which this nation has been blessed out of the happy *fifty;* nor would it be amiss if you were to lay before the convivial guests a detailed account of those who have lately died at Walcheren, and of the thousands of sick and wounded left behind, by our general in Spain, to the mercy of the French; aye, to the mercy of those very French, whom the "loyal" writers in England denominate "*blood-thirsty villains.*" Returning again to the blessings of our present state, and the cause we have for joy, you may remind your hearers, that the king's servants, in their extreme care of us, have introduced a very considerable body of foreign troops into the country; a whole Legion of Germans, horse, foot, and artillery. You may remind them of the present state of Ireland, and bid them not to forget the number of years, during the present reign, that saw the *personal security act suspended*, and during which years many of their countrymen were kept, for years in jail; without being brought to trial from first to last.——If this be not enough, if you find them still backward in rejoicing, remind them of the taxes they have to pay, and of the purposes to which they are applied; and, pray do, Sir, show them that there are many individual sinecure placemen, and many pensioners, any one of whom swallows up more of the taxes, *in one month*, than goes to the keeping of all the poor in Droxford for a *whole year*.——Should they still be insensible to your eloquence, remind them of the history of the Darling, not forgetting your old neighbour; late a tenant of Newgate. Your Reverend coadjutors may expound to them the case of the holy Doctors O'Meara and Locke, and of the reverend Mr. Beazely, and bid any one produce, if he can, any thing the like thereof in any other reign. Any loyal lady, who chances to be present, may enter upon the rise, progress, and suspension of the "*Delicate Investigation*;" and, if they still remain unmoved, why tell them, tell them yourself, Sir, the history of the *Garniers* and the sinecure.

I should not have revived this topic, Sir, had not your letter, circulated through the whole of the parish, and, of course, amongst many of my neighbours, left it to be clearly inferred, that all those who did not *give money*, to be expended in the way that you and Mr. Garnier and Mr. Nott chose to point out, were *disloyal* men. I have every reason to suppose that you knew, that my sentiments were opposed to any celebration of the day in question; to any act or deed which might give countenance to the thing to be called a Jubilee. But, whether you knew this, or not, a circular letter from

you, making the act of subscribing *a test of loyalty*, and accompanied with a subscription paper having my name ready written upon it, contingently inferred the accusation of disloyalty. You send me one paper with a list of names as subscribers to the Jubilee, and amongst those names you place mine; and you, at the same time, send me another paper which tells me, in words the meaning of which is not to be misunderstood, that, unless I give my money, I shall be considered as *disloyal*. I do *not* choose to give my money, and your imputation of disloyalty follows of course. This imputation is a thing for me to laugh at; but, as my intention is to cause this letter to be read by all those who have read your letter, I shall here add a sentence or two for the purpose of shewing them what is the real meaning of the word *loyalty*, according to its modern acceptation, and by way of illustration, to give them a striking example of loyalty in the head of the family of that Garnier, who, as your letter states, thought it was "a *pity* that the parish of Droxford should appear *less loyal* than its neighbours."

Be it known, then, to those of our neighbours, amongst whom you have circulated your letter, that *loyalty*, now-a-days, means the getting of a good round sum annually out of the taxes, or, at least, it means *living upon the public*. For this we have a fine practical instance in Mr. Garnier of Wickham, who, though he has never, during his whole lifetime, done for the public one single hour's service; though it has been given in evidence before the House of Commons, that he never has meddled at all with any business for the public; though these facts are indisputable, this Mr. Garnier does get of the public money upwards *of twelve thousand pounds a year*, arising from an office, which he has enjoyed *ever since he was a boy at school*, and which though not formerly so profitable, or nearly so profitable, as at present, was always a place of great profit. The total sum that he must have, during the whole time, cleared by this place, cannot be less than *three or four hundred thousand pounds*. If that is not a proof of *loyalty*, I do not know what is a proof of loyalty. But, Mr. Garnier has given a still stronger proof of his loyalty; for, not content with pocketting, out of the public money, *twelve thousand pounds a year*, under the denomination of profits of his office of Apothecary General; not thinking this a sufficient proof of his attachment to the king and his government, what does he do, but gets a post *in the army* at the pay of *ten shillings a day!* Not content with twelve thousand pounds a year out of the public money, out of the taxes that we pay; not content with this immense sum *for doing nothing*; for, observe, it is proved, upon oath, that he has never meddled with any part of the business; not content with twelve thousand a year for doing nothing, he asks for, and gets, from the government, from that government whose conduct we are to have a Jubilee to applaud; he gets from that government an allowance of *ten shillings a day* as *a medical officer in the army*; and, while he lives constantly at Wickham, he is now actually in the receipt of this ten shillings a day (unless it be very lately taken off) out of the taxes that we pay. Aye, well, indeed, may men like this hold a Jubilee in praise of this long reign of war and taxation; this reign, the wars of which have, perhaps, put into the pockets of the Garniers not less than *two hundred thousand pounds*.

By this time, Sir, I hope, that you begin to be convinced, that there are some of us, at least, who understand too well the worth of modern loyalty to fear the effects of any such imputations as that, which, contingently at least, is conveyed in your letter; and that, by means of that sort, we shall not have the money extracted from our pockets. If Mr. Garnier, indeed, has a mind to give back to the people any portion, however small, or if another of your neighbours, Mr. Sturges Bourne, has a mind to give back a part of what he is annually receiving out of the taxes, let them do it; but, let them not accuse me or Mr. Chidell or Mr. Edney or Mr. Cowdry or Mr. Parrott, or any of the rest of us, of disloyalty, that is to say, of a very serious crime; let them not so accuse us, because we do not choose to give our money to make people rejoice at events which have produced great mischief to the nation in general, and good to none but those, who live upon the public, who get rich in proportion as the nation gets poor, whose riches do, in fact, spring from the same sources as the people's poverty. To all such accusations; all attempts made at getting popularity amongst the parishioners at our expence; all attempts at forcing us to give away our money, or to submit to be represented as hard-hearted towards the poor; all these at-

tempts we shall repel merely by stating, that Mr. Garnier of Wickham receives out of the public money more, *every month*, than is expended in keeping the poor of Droxford parish for a whole year; that, if only one *tenth* part of his income were distributed amongst the poor of Droxford, there would not need any parish rates at all, for there would be no poor; and that, of course, if he would give up the whole of what he receives from the public *for doing nothing*, it would, for ever, take away all poor, leave not one poor person, in *ten parishes* like that of Droxford. By statements like this we shall always answer any attempts to make us, who *earn* what we spend, appear hard-hearted to the poor. We shall not, upon such occasions, forget, that farmers Parrott and Edney and Chidell, and the like; that every man who possesses any property; aye, and that even the day-labourer, whose very quid of tobacco is taxed, assists in maintaining the splendid equipage of Mr. Sturges Bourne, and the rattling coach-and-four of Mr. Garnier. Yes, Sir, I trust, that the day is not far distant, when not a man, either in Droxford parish or in any other, will want assistance to make him clearly understand these things; and, as for the present essay, if it should prove, in any degree, conducive to this great purpose, our neighbours will have to thank you much more than

Your most humble
and most obedient servant,
WM. COBBETT.

The other topics, intended for this sheet, must be postponed.——I had prepared an article or two, when Mr. Goodlad's letter was received, this morning, about nine o'clock. I thought it a duty I owed to the public (for it applies to every part of the kingdom) to answer this letter without delay; and, neither of the other articles could be inserted, without dividing them.

PISTOLLING PRIVY COUNSELLORS.

"Ill-weav'd ambition, how much art thou shrunk!"

My Dear Sir;—We think so much alike on all great points, and your very conjectures have been of late so prophetic, that I am inclined most seriously to doubt my own judgment, when it differs from yours even in matters of the most trifling importance.

Such is my present predicament, which I therefore esteem unfortunate, in contemplating the rencontre between the "pistolling privy counsellors." An incident, which, though exceedingly degrading to the character of the government, is by no means, as I think, to be regretted by the country. On the contrary, I consider it a topic of congratulation; and as it is unique, and peculiar to the auspicious reign of his present majesty, (which may God indefinitely prolong!) and adds one to the many considerations, which constitute the propriety of, as also may become an harmonious ingredient in compounding the loyal and dutiful Address, which the judicious Livery of London is so shortly to carry up to the throne, I would by no means have it omitted in it. The only objection, indeed, which I see to the including the incident in the Address, consists in the catastrophe not having been so complete, as one could have wished.—For my own part, I am anxious to see the idea pushed a little further, and when the Lord Mayor furnishes his hot cold beef, I think that a *petit plat* representing the duel itself, the combatants and their accessaries in a pale tremulous *blanc manger*, with a *fac simile* of the blood and wound in currant jelly, (which Colonel Birch's loyal ingenuity might accomplish to the life) would be highly gratifying to the taste of the Jubilee "Mawmen," as well as be a device in itself most appropriate and pleasing to the curious. But as *blanc manger* in such a situation is a perishable commodity, I would, in order the better to perpetuate and transmit the achievement, have a medal or coin of the value of a half crown, struck, emblematic of the occasion; wherein the united effigies of Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning (instead of looking one way as in the coins of William and Mary) might, like Galba's most apposite medal of the Honos and Virtus, be placed vis-a-vis, with a hostile frown at each other. This coin, I will predict, would have a great run in the remote counties, ignorance and curiosity being inseparable; and as a circulating medium is much wanted, the adoption of my proposition in this respect would be a converting, possibly for the first time these 50 years, of the actions of politicians to the benefit of their country. In pursuit of the same thought, I would, as a distinct and separate honour to Mr. Canning, suggest to his majesty's ministers, to the President of the Royal Society, and indeed to his own classical taste, the idea of another gem, containing an effigy only of himself in the attitude of the famous

Gladiator Moriens; and that Lord C. may not be jealous of this exclusive attention, I would suggest to him the hint of a coin representing himself in brass, as a Gladiator also, holding a little Victoria in one hand, with a convulsive grasp at a seal, which has just fallen from the other.—An imperial coin also, emblematical of the harmony of the cabinet, might be struck, having, as was customary with the emperors, a Concordia on its reverse.—But, to give you my serious reasons why I cordially approve of the duelling or pistolling ministers, distinct from this commemorative view of the matter:—1st, then, I think, it holds out to the people a very pleasing prospect of relief from their misfortunes, without any risk to themselves. 2ndly, to look at it in another light or two: I highly approve of the example of making ministers responsible in their persons for their political misconduct. This is good, extremely good; the transition not being at all abrupt from this to the making them in their persons responsible also to the people, to whom some persons may think a greater responsibility was due, than to each other. And although one might desire to make some little change in the article of execution, (as a death more appropriate than shooting would naturally suggest itself) yet, for the sake of unanimity, I would not cavil about trifles, such as mode or manner; and, therefore, provided substantial justice could at all seasons be obtained for the country, upon the persons of its ministers, I would not be a pedant to investigate whether there might be any solid reason for preferring hemp before lead for the occasion.—3rdly, as a gratifying spectacle to the nation, I must approve of the pistolling in the following point of view, wherein I consider it as a sort of *amende honorable* to the nation. I reason thus:—An immense sum had been expended by the discharged Right Honourable Pistoller in his warlike expedition against Walcheren; Now we approve of taxes and expenditure, the more lavish the better; it is the more creditable to the spirit and resources of the country; besides it goes more directly to the goal at which every thing conspires to drive. But when the people of England have turned their very purses inside out, in order to equip a gallant expedition, they do not think, that they have any right to expect it to be conducted with either vigour or success, but they do conceive themselves by a sort of *jus gentium* entitled to an equivalent; or, to speak more diplomatically, to a *quid pro quo*; that is, they have an equitable right to a battle: Now as Lord C. sent out a Cabinet General, who either would not, or could not, or at least did not fight, (all three being the same to us) the battle necessarily was returned to him, and lay upon his shoulders. And it is, in this regard, that I think Lord Castlereagh acted so very honourably towards us, in his transferring the war campaign from the continent to the cabinet, and in his taking back the battle from the General (who was well pleased to return it) to be fought by the Secretaries. Yet if the sword did little for the noble Lord's reputation amongst the people, disease has been extremely propitious to him; the climate has achieved what was omitted by the enemy: and death has been a most efficient *ex post facto* colleague to the noble Secretary, making him in this respect ample amends for all Mr. Canning's insincerity! In fine, one may apply to Lord Castlereagh what was poetically said of another noble sufferer:—"Nothing "in his (political) life became him like "the leaving it."—4thly, there is a view which you have taken of this cannonade on Putney Heath, where, in the animated expression of your abhorrence at the indecency of the transaction, you appear to me to have for a moment lost sight of that impartiality, which is the honour of history, and the peculiar glory of your publication. I refer to your allusion to the case of Major Campbell; which you appear in the sometimes indispensible hurry of perusal to have mistaken. Major C. was found guilty of murder by a jury in the ordinary course of law. So found, because there appeared evidence, that he had killed a brother officer, whom he had compelled to fight him under unusual circumstances; leading to violent suspicion of unfairness; corroborated by the dying exclamation of the man who fell. Execution would in due course have followed the sentence upon the verdict. The government so far had nothing to do with it; the ministry, indeed, might have advised the king to remit the punishment, but they did not: and in my opinion this was the best, and, for any thing I know to the contrary, the only good advice they ever gave his majesty. Now surely, my dear Sir, to draw the analogy a little closer, you do not believe, that if providentially Canning had shot Castlereagh, (for we are taught "that not a sparrow falls!" &c.) or *vice versâ*, that Castlereagh had providentially

shot Canning, a jury of 12 Englishmen would have found either guilty of felony! What! hang Canning for shooting Castlereagh, or hang Castlereagh for shooting Canning!!! Good God, Mr. Cobbett, have you ever read the Marquis Beccario, or what an opinion have you formed of the freeholders of Middlesex? Let me entreat you to look at this matter then rather in its patriotic consequences, than in its exceptions, as an innovation; and, indeed, I am not afraid that, when you shall have reconsidered its valuable tendency, you will unite to mine your important approbation of it.—I am now naturally led from my panegyric upon the catastrophe, to a consideration of the plot, with a rapid appreciation of the respective merits of the performers. "O! that my enemy would write a book!" may, on this occasion, be narrowed to "O! that my enemy would write a letter!" Let us examine Lord Castlereagh's, which has matter in it deserving a few moments attention. We there, notwithstanding all that constitutional dreamers have dreamt upon the subject, find it publicly avowed, by a Secretary of State, that the King of England does not chuse his own ministers; but that, by an accommodating species of *co-optatio* (a thing prohibited by the Romans,) they virtually chuse each other. So that we have not even the small chance of that very small quantity of integrity, which collision and opposition might by bare possibility strike out of the independent action of 12 or 13 politicians in their several departments; but persons are put into one office, because they will be, or what is in effect the same thing, are turned out because they will not be, subservient to the views of the person, who fills another; and that person the leader of a faction in the House of Commons! This is the real and true state of the case, for to talk of any difference in principle, would be ridiculous in reference to two men, who were the underlings of Pitt, and the humble, or as the Edinburgh Reviewers would have it, the "sympathetic," or perhaps the "lofty," instruments of the worst measures of his detestable administration. —I now proceed to the mere personal matter in the letter; Lord Castlereagh, in a missive, which should have contained but the four words, begins it by telling Mr. C. that "he has deceived him." Now there, if this had been true, he stood on good ground, as a man, although, *perhaps*, not as a politician. The quarrel in short (as Sir Lucius O'Trigger would have said) was a very pretty quarrel, as it stood; especially between two persons, having each something of the potatoe in him. I have however put a *perhaps*, for I really do not see how one factious placeholding politician can deceive another. An Italian meets his friend, and with open arms embraces him, but he has a stiletto in his hand, which his friend expects, and is disengaging his own; Now this first Italian does not deceive the other: he does indeed stab him, but that is clear another matter; for it is obvious by the precautions he was using, that his adversary did not deceive him. No, no! call it by its right name, and then we must say that he was only the most dexterous. In a word, there is no deception amongst the punters in politics; loaded dice are fair at that game, and every body uses them. But was I even to admit that a politician's honour could suffer by his being duped, I have no data to ascertain in that respect, what Lord C. could have lost. For in order to find that unknown quantity, we require two other quantities to be assigned, which after the strictest search appear to me undiscoverable; I mean the quantity of that quality, political honour, that really and *bonâ fide* belonged to Lord C. or was imputed to him by his countrymen, either in England or Ireland, before Mr. Canning discharged him, and the quantity, (which must have grievously suffered indeed by any deduction from it) that remained in his lawful possession at the very instant he discovered that Mr. Canning had robbed him of the rest! If one could get from any confidential friend, from any of all the Seymours for example, and I adjure them by all their places and pensions! (for the public is in total ignorance respecting his honour) these quantities truly assigned, one might, as I said before, not only find out what Lord Castlereagh had lost at the period alluded to, and which he so affectingly regrets, but one might even discover, which is indeed a much more curious point, what positive quantity he actually possesses now; and which, so far as I know, we have no other data whatsoever for ascertaining! But allowing Lord Castlereagh to be his own voucher for more or less of that quality, which "hath no skill in surgery," and "cannot take away the grief of a wound," let us inquire if he even himself thought that Mr. Canning had impeached it by concealing his discharge from him; Why, the very reverse

is distinctly stated in so many words in the actual letter, in the actual same letter; wherein he admits that Mr. Canning did press its being communicated to him; a matter, resisted, by whom? why, by his very own friends; who doubtless knew very well that he would be much better pleased by continuing to receive his emoluments than by being prematurely informed of an arrangement, the knowledge of which would have been incompatible with his retaining them. His friends, I think, judged very prudently, from their intimate knowledge of the man, and not at all the less so, for not having said one syllable about his honour; which, from some strange misconception or other, appears, in the whole of this business, to have occurred to nobody but himself! I omit the prosing metaphysical matter, and a great deal of very bad reasoning relative to his having been dishonoured by his continuing to exercise his functions, after he had been virtually superseded, contained in the middle of the letter, because it is obvious, that he conceives (whatever the nation may) that disgrace was to attach to him, not in respect of any past misconduct in his office, but in respect of his being virtually superseded therein without his knowing it; whilst it is nevertheless quite palpable to the capacity of a child, that no person can be disgraced by conscientiously continuing to discharge the functions of a public office, so long as he is not aware or apprized of any thing having occurred, which would make it proper for him to retire from it. I will only just farther observe, that having at the close of his letter, abandoned the only good pretext for calling Canning out, contained in it, namely, that he had deceived him, he again changes his ground, and rests his quarrel on a point nearly or altogether indifferent, viz. on the mode or manner of doing a thing, which he admits in the same sentence that the other had a right to do: and which indeed, the very letter written by himself to attack the act proves, by its absurdities, ought to have been done effectually as well as virtually many many months before. The truth here, as in almost every case, lies in a nut shell; from which, the following is not probably very remote. Canning wanted Castlereagh's place for a friend, Castlereagh was of no importance to any living soul but himself: his colleagues therefore gave him up at once, rather than suffer the diminution of Canning's abilities in the House of Commons. The time was not ripe for putting in Canning's friend; and Castlereagh's friends, who must have known him better than any body else, (though he now disowns them!) thought, that they could not oblige him more, than by continuing to him *pro tempore* the emoluments of his office; they therefore did not wish to tell him, what would have compelled him to relinquish these profits (for to suppose that the abilities of the person who wrote that letter could be of any use even to the present administration would be ridiculous); they therefore concealed it from him, and, in doing so, acted the part of friends to him; (to which, as is customary, he makes the return of resentment). He necessarily protracted their friendly motives in acting so towards him; and therefore, as it would have been preposterous, if not ludicrous, in him, to have called out his friends, he challenges, on the refuted ground of his having deceived him, the only member of the cabinet, who, as far as we know from the letter, demonstrated a desire not to have deceived him! The fact I should take to be, that Castlereagh, if he saw at all, must have seen, that he had no one solid reason for challenging Canning, that did not apply much more strongly to perhaps every other member of the cabinet: he consequently vacillates from one pretext to another, until, as is common with men in that situation, he at length fixes on the worst. He could not challenge his own friends, who were the people that really deceived him; and his quarrel, not being about his honour, as he says, but about his office, he naturally, because revenge is natural, (only he will not allow it) challenged the man, by whose proposition he was to be turned out of it.——By the bye, people never know themselves; if they did, Castlereagh would never have shot Canning for not carrying a proposition into effect, for an "inchoate act;" since he could not so soon have forgotten, that, in the last Session of Parliament, Canning had got him acquitted of a most damnable charge, on the sheer and sole ground of the act imputed not having been carried into complete effect by him! Some of your readers perhaps begin by this time to consider me as the apologist of Canning; whereas nothing is more remote from my intention. Castlereagh has selected him out of many others, his associates, as the fittest on whom to fix a charge of deception. He must know

him better than we do; and I have no doubt whatever that though erroneous in his instance, and wrong in his reasoning, he is right in his imputation. I acknowledge, however, that I do feel a desire on this occasion to remove from Mr. Canning's shoulders a burthen, which he ought not exclusively to carry. The ass's fault ought not to be laid upon the pack saddle. Amongst them, they have insulted lord Castlereagh's honour, as he says; I have endeavoured in a friendly way to convince him, that he fixed wrong in fixing upon Canning, and that, consequently, the discharge of a lump of lead into Canning's posteriors leaves his honour just where it was before.—Let him now then fix right; and there is one comprehensive way, the "*servetur ad imum,*" in which he will be sure, first or last, to get the right sow by the ear; and should his majesty be then pleased to adopt for his cabinet the regulations of his army, whereby, in vacancies so occasioned, the promotion is prohibited from going in the regiment, should this, I say, take place, and the Whigs accordingly succeed to the command, who knows, but that, in their complete "coalition with the memories" of Pitt, and No Popery, they may adopt also for their example, the dissensions in the cabinet, and, inspired by Providence, may also imitate Lord Castlereagh's mode of deciding them. As my feather writes this, a beam of hope seems to shine upon the country, with a faint promise to us, that though England, corrupted as her establishments now are, can never dream of being defended by the union of her inhabitants, she may yet be saved by the dissensions of her ministers. With a fervent prayer, then, that the safety of the country may come this way, if it can come no other (a prayer the more sincere, as its accomplishment will suit my hypothesis,) I hasten to my conclusion of this tedious letter, whose substance I fully intended to have comprised in twenty lines. Permit me to add, that I am as sensible as you can be of the dull matter-of-fact tenor of its arguments; I am aware that you will perceive, as I indeed did with frequent struggles of self denial, the many occasions of vivacity and pleasantry which were spontaneously presented to me by the subject, but which I avoided, "under Providence," by an incessant consideration of the welfare of my country being at stake; which I thought an unseasonable levity might wound;—for as the interests were weighty, so the style I deemed should be serious. Above all, I hope you will see that I have endeavoured carefully to avoid any remark, which can be esteemed disrespectful, either towards our aged and beloved sovereign, his government, or the country. Moreover, I have, with a world of pains, expunged whatever in my rough copy appeared to me either sarcastic, or satirical upon the combatants. Considering them indeed, (which one must do, now that they are "*functi officio,*") as men politically dead, I have passed with a classical charity, mingled with melancholy over their ashes the "*favillus adhuc calentes*" both of the poet and the politician; whilst "*de mortuis nil nisi bonum*" will at once be recognised to have been my rule. On this score, I feel that I have a conscience void of offence, and therefore have nothing to dread. But if it be objected to me, as I most fear, that I have erred on the other side, the side of good nature, by sometimes swerving from rigid impartiality, in putting a more favourable construction upon certain parts of their conduct, than they will bear, I must, like Mrs. Mal-a-prop, "own the soft impeachment;" I here confess my weakness; I know it to be my vulnerable side; but I appeal to the benevolence of our nature, and as the error is amiable, I hope the censure will be charitable!

I remain, my Dear Sir,
Sincerely yours,
J. C. WORTHINGTON.

Cottage, Southampton, Oct. 10, 1809.

ANSWER TO THE EDINBURGH REVIEW ON THE SUBJECT OF REFORM IN PARLIAMENT.

From the Glasgow Sentinel.

Sir,—The Edinburgh Review is a work which I have long considered as a light shining in darkness, and the darkness comprehending it not; and when in its attack upon Mr. Cobbett, I found it advocating the cause of parliamentary dependence, it appeared to me as something struck out rather by the collision of contest, than the genuine sentiments of the writer. In the last Number of that work, however, no room is left to doubt, that it looks upon the independence of parliament as an impossible, or a dangerous thing. That such an opi-

nion is false in theory, is subversive of all free government in practice, and is at utter enmity with the constitution of our country, I do not despair to shew; but in order to do so, I must begin with Mr. Hume, the real author of the opinion in question; "We may," says he (Essay on the Independency of Parliament) "give "to this influence, what name we please; "we may call it by the invidious appella- "tions of corruption and dependence, but "some degree and some kind of it are in- "separable from the very nature of the "constitution, and necessary to the pre- "servation of our mixt government." In a note, he affects to limit this crown influence to offices and honours, and deprecates what he calls private bribery; by which, I suppose, he means pecuniary influence; as a shameless prostitution, and as always infamous under all ministers: but notwithstanding this distinction, I believe if he had compared his ideas, he would have come to the same conclusion with regard to both species. For the influence by offices and honours, either must weigh in a member's mind, so far as to direct his judgment, and determine his vote, or it must not; if it does, what can money do more? if it does not, it is useless. But to leave this distinction, a distinction without a difference; let us proceed to the principle itself; speaking of the House of Commons, he says, "how "easy would it be for that house to wrest "from the Crown all its powers, one after "another, by making every grant condi- "tional, and choosing their time so well, "that their refusal of supply should only "distress the government, without giving "foreign powers any advantage over us." In this sagacious query, the learned gentleman seems inclined to carry his theory of the want of connection between cause and effect as far as it will go; but I am so far a disciple of the old school, as to conceive that there can be no effect without a cause, that in the event of the House of Commons wishing to deprive the Crown of its powers, it must either have the support of the people, or it must not; if it have not, it can do no harm; the king, by dissolving the house, can give an opportunity to the people to send other representatives, juster bearers of the public sentiment; if it have that support, then the discontent of the people is an effect which must have an adequate cause; either those powers vested in the Crown are grievous to the people, and hard to be borne, or they are not; if they are, they deserve to be abolished; if they are not, it is not conceivable that the people should give that support to the House of Commons, which is necessary to the subversion of monarchy. So much for the effect likely to be produced on the monarchical part of our constitution, by the subject in question. Let us now see its effects on the democratical part of it; this we will find in the very next passage after the one last quoted from Hume. "Did the House of Commons," says he, "depend in the same manner on "the king, and had none of the members "any property but from his gift, would "not he command all their resolutions, "and be from that moment absolute?" Now, in an assembly where the resolutions are carried by the majority, either the majority are influenced, or they are not; if they are not, this influence, "invidi- "ously called corruption and dependence" is of no use, and our mixed government still remaining, shews that for its preservation, it stands in no need of such an assistant; if the majority be influenced, what is this, to use the words of Mr. Locke, (on Government, 2. § 222.) "but to cut "up the government by the roots, and "poison the very fountain of public secu- "rity? for the people having reserved "to themselves the choice of their re- "presentatives, as the fence to their "properties, could do it for no other "end, but that they might always be "freely chosen, and, so chosen, freely "act and advise, as the necessity of the "commonwealth and the public good "should, upon examination and mature "debate, be judged to require. This, "those who give their votes before they "hear the debate, and have weighed the "reasons on all sides, are not capable of "doing. To prepare such an assembly as "this, and endeavour to set up the declared "abettors of his own will, for the true re- "presentatives of the people, and the law- "makers of the society, is certainly as "great a breach of trust, and as perfect a "declaration of a design to subvert the "government, as is possible to be met "with."—I now come to shew that parliamentary dependence, is, in proportion to its extent, subversive of all free government, in practice: and in order to be convinced of this, we have only to consult history, and observe the gradations by which, when the Legislative and Executive powers have been vested in distinct bodies, the former have gradually become

subservient to the latter; and the conclusion will hold equally good, whether the Legislative be an hereditary or elected body. In Roman history, for example, the Senate, by the disturbances and bloodshed that took place, during, and immediately after the first of the Cæsars, had lost much of its power and dignity. Its purgation was reserved for Augustus, who, by expelling some members, and persuading others to take themselves off, attempted its reformation; but this being his own act, and by his own individual power, necessarily brought that body under his controul. "Whilst," says Gibbon (Roman Emp.) "he thus restored the dignity, he "destroyed the independence of the Se-"nate. The principles of a free constitu-"tion are irrecoverably lost, when the "Legislative power is nominated by the "Executive." We accordingly find that that body from whom the kings of the earth were wont to solicit an audience, as its slaves and freedmen, fell more and more into contempt, till its power and authority were annihilated by Dioclesian, and the universal maxim came to be, "The will of the Prince is the supreme "law." If we look to the history of Spain, we will find that both in Arragon and Castile, the Cortes, though independent, and invested with much greater powers than are vested in the House of Commons, did not subvert monarchy. In the principality of Catalonia, indeed, the impatience of the people to obtain redress of their grievances, did induce them to take up arms against their Sovereign John II. A. D. 1462, and to endeavour to establish a republican form of government; but this was the work of a whole people, goaded to desperation by misgovernment, and not the endeavour of one part of their constitution, in consequence of its independence, to subvert the other. Seventy-seven years after this period, we find the ancient constitution of the Castilian Cortes subverted by Charles, and an assembly, to use the words of Dr. Robertson (Hist. Chas. V.) "bearing no resemblance, either in power, "or dignity, or independence, to the an-"cient Cortes, and absolutely at the devo-"tion of the court in all their determina-"tions," substituted in its room; and so of the others, till at last the whole Peninsula was grasped by despotism.—It would be tedious to trace the fate of government in the different countries of Europe, where in consequence of the early inhabitants being allodial proprietors, the legislative powers were vested in Parliaments, Assemblies of the Estates, Cortes, and Diets; different from and controuling the executive, and where, in course of time, by force or fraud, the executive came to controul the legislative. It may be remarked, however, that the mode of controul does not alter the question, the ascendancy which an executive obtains over a legislative, by (to use the polite name of) influence, being just as certain as that which it obtains by the dread of banishment, or a Bastile; and is more pernicious, in fact, inasmuch as slavery, under the semblance of liberty, is more hopeless than open and undisguised slavery, against which there is greater probability of mankind asserting the rights of their nature. Having thus shewn that the necessity of Parliamentary dependence to the continuance of our mixed government, is false in theory, and in practice subversive of every thing like freedom, no Briton, I think, will deny, that the third position flows as a corollary from the two first, and that parliamentary dependence is at utter enmity with the constitution of our country. The authority of Blackstone, on this last point, is decisive. "The constitutional "government of this island," says he, (Com. Introd. § 2d.) "is so admirably "tempered and compounded, that nothing "can endanger or hurt it, but destroying "the equilibrium of power between one "branch of the legislature and the rest. "For, if ever it should happen, that the "independence of any one should be lost, "or that it should become subservient "to the views of either of the other "two, there would soon be an end of "our constitution." If the above reasoning be correct, the independence of parliament is a thing which ought to be granted to the people of Britain, as their just right, whether it would or would not reduce "the burden of our taxes," "the "preponderating influence of the Crown," "and the monopoly of political power." —Leaving, therefore, those topics into which the Reviewer has entered at so great length, as scarcely bearing upon the main point; we find him, (in page 800 of the Review), apprehending, as Mr. Hume has done before him, that an alteration in the House of Commons would be attended with the abolition both of the Crown and Aristocracy: but in his enunciation of this position, he seems to be guilty of an unfairness, similar to that, to which some aristocrats have recourse, who

in beating down every thing that savours of democracy, choose to draw their picture of the people of Britain in the 19th century, from Shakespeare's description of the Roman populace in Coriolanus, or of Jack Cade and his associates in Henry 6th. For, that the house of Commons would not be composed entirely of the representatives of the yeomanry and tradesmen, is sufficiently manifest to any one, that will for a moment consider of what sort of men the Commons of Britain are composed; that they consist of the younger branches of noble families; of knights; of country gentlemen of great landed property; of wealthy merchants and manufacturers; and of the individuals in the three learned professions; as well as of the yeomanry of the counties, and the tradesmen of the burghs; now although the representation were to go by numbers only, yet, from the very nature of things, and the situation of society, the sentiments of the two latter classes, would be much modelled by those of the former; indeed, the apprehensions which some affect to entertain of the versatility and turbulence of the people, limiting the phrase even to the two last classes of commoners, appear to me rather symptomatic of hypochondria, as in all countries, attachment to old customs, and aversion from novelty, are generally found to be the characteristics of the great body of the people; who, says Locke, (on Government, 2. § 223), "are "not so easily got out of their old forms, "as some are apt to suggest. They are "hardly to be prevailed with to amend "the acknowledged faults in the frame "they have been accustomed to. And "if there be any original defects, or "adventitious ones introduced by time, or "corruption; it is not an easy thing "to be changed, even when all the world "sees there is an opportunity for it.— "This slowness and aversion in the people "to quit their old constitutions, has, in the "many revolutions that have been seen in "this kingdom, in this and former ages, "still kept us to, or after some interval of "fruitless attempt, still brought us back "again to our old legislature of King, "Lords, and Commons: and whatever "provocations have made the Crown be "taken from some of our Princes' heads, "they never carried the people so far as "to place it in another line." But a most beneficial Reform could be introduced into Parliament, and at the same time leave to wealth and stake in the country, that influence which it always will and ought to have. Let the elective franchise be extended to every man, who, to use Blackstone's phrase, may have a will of his own; suppose that the number of electors so qualified, amounts to two millions, and that the number of members to be returned to Parliament is 400; if the qualified population be divided into 200 equal parts, it will give 10,000 electors to every member, and thus half the representatives will be returned, who will, of course, be the representatives of the population. The wealth of the country may be equally easily represented by the Income Tax being made permanent, and divided into 200 equal parts, and every district where one of these parts is levied, returning a member, the person paying 5*l.* of tax, having one vote, and, if 50*l.* ten votes, and so in proportion; the American mode of collecting the taxes being adopted, and the longest term of one parliament being three years. What is next said about the House of Commons, sending up a number of popular bills, is just what Hume says about their divesting the Crown of its powers, and it is therefore to be answered in the same manner. Next, of the Nobility of England being no longer distinguishable as to their interests from her opulent Commoners, and of there being no intelligible grounds for excluding the influence of the one, more than that of the other; I perfectly agree to, supposing, that their judicial business were performed openly, as it is said to be virtually, by the Lord Chancellor; and that they were to cease to exist as a separate body. They would then certainly have a right to vote for the representatives both of the wealth and population; but so long as they choose to have a house of their own, possessed of a *veto* upon the proceedings of the House of Commons, it is manifestly unfair that they should have any thing to say in this House. The support which is next endeavoured to be drawn from history in favour of the principle, appears to me equally misplaced; for, in the first place, a despotical government never can be a secure one, and the abolition of monarchy in England, had nearly the same origin, as the revolt of Holland and Zealand, under the infamous government of the Duke of Alva. In the second place, Charles, by consenting to the Parliament having the power of continuing itself, vested in it an unconstitutional and improper power, and

such as now-a-days would never be granted. Perfectly agreeing with the writer in his last paragraph, I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,—A. Z.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

WAR BETWEEN AUSTRIA AND FRANCE, AND THE EXPEDITION TO HOLLAND.—*Notes from the French Official Paper, the Moniteur, on the Articles published in the London Papers upon the above subjects.* *(Continued from page 576.)*

On the 1st of September there were between Flanders and the Scheldt and Maestricht, 20,000 men under arms. They were not all regulars, but they were all commanded by men who had served; they were all volunteers, and consisted, for the most part, of former under officers, and former soldiers who had obtained their discharges, and who had run to arms on the first signal.—Lord Chatham, therefore, charged himself with a senseless operation, and those, therefore, who projected it, shewed themselves to be as ignorant of the climate as of the localities. Lord Chatham saved the English army by determining to re-embark it; but every day that he delays to execute this determination, heightens the misfortunes of his expedition, and if he is culpable, it is not in having ordered the retreat, it is in having so long delayed to re-embark; for during this delay, the English troops contract fresh diseases, and become infected with fresh seeds of destruction.—Let it suffice to say that the Emperor, when he learned that an English army had been landed upon that point, recommended that it should not be attacked, and that we should leave the destruction of it to the diseases, which, in that dangerous climate, must do the enemy more injury than the cannon, without its costing any thing to France.

The English, in landing in Flanders, did, therefore, a thing contrary to all the rules of war: 1st. Because they took for the theatre of their operations a country so unwholesome, that they had to presume that a month's stay in it would destroy this army; that the country is covered with strong places, such as Flushing, Bergen-op-Zoom, Bathz, and Lillo; and on the side of the Island of Cadsand, the new Fort Napoleon, &c. &c. 2d. Because their principal object appeared to be to capture the squadron; they ought to have imagined that the squadron depended upon Antwerp, and that Antwerp was impregnable, for its communications with France could not be cut off, except by immense armies, against which the whole population of France would have time to march.—The result of all which is, that the English have been for so many years shut out of the Continent, that they are no longer acquainted with it. Every thing has changed, except their hatred against France.

With regard to the Island of Walcheren, it is said that they mean to keep it. We should have only cause to applaud this resolution for many reasons; 1st. The English, although they had 20,000 men in the Island of Walcheren, could not prevent it from being attacked and retaken; 2d. 20,000 English, exposed to the influence of the climate, would experience so much loss, that it would be necessary to be continually reinforcing them: that, in the course of the year, 80,000 men would as necessarily become victims to the climate, and it would cost them more to guard this marsh than to preserve the East Indies: but it is probable that time would not be left for them to suffer such losses. The channel between the two Islands is so narrow, that bombs can reach from the one to the other. The twenty ships of the line, and the flotilla which we have in the Scheldt, would soon make us masters of that river. It would not be forgotten, that four years ago, and with our flotilla alone, we were masters of all the coast; can it be doubted that we should be soon masters of a closed sea? and can it, at the same time, be supposed that the English would attempt to keep Flushing without being masters of the Scheldt? Besides, a flotilla is too dangerous a war for them. Such a war is not carried on with boats alone; it is conducted with excellent troops, that is to say, with means which do not allow the English any advantage over us.

We well know that men exist who, although completely ignorant of the art of war, have, notwithstanding, the silly habit of taking and endeavouring to give counsel to those who are masters in it; those people, yet more skilful than that public speaker who introduced the subject of war before Hannibal, tell you, that the English, by preserving the Island of Walcheren, will make it a second Gibraltar, or another Malta; in fine, a commanding point which will render them masters of Flanders, of Holland, &c. Poor madmen! they cannot perceive that if the English persist in keep-

ing the Island of Walcheren, that circumstance would be as advantageous for us as if they were embarrassed in the heart of Spain.—In general, whenever an English army lands on the Continent, every real Frenchman ought to rejoice.—Such a contest is completely in our favour: a nation of three millions of men cannot meet man for man a nation of forty millions. A new army, all the elements of which are in the navy, cannot keep the field against the veteran forces which have conquered two-thirds of Europe; in fine, an army which can only arrive by sea, has neither artillery, cavalry, nor equipages, at least it has a very great inferiority in all these means, and lord Chatham really could not mount more than 2,000 cavalry? well! before 15 days were elapsed, the French effective cavalry, which were assembled on the Banks of the Scheldt, amounted to 4,000!

'Reflecting also that our troops are not 'led on by a Marlborough, a Wolfe, 'or even a Wellesley.'

We here see what the spirit of party is capable of. It is a pity that Sir Arthur Wellesley had not the command instead of Lord Chatham. The latter saved the English army; the other would probably have lost it, as he has lost that which he commanded in Spain—where he had the imprudence to entangle himself with 30,000 men, without reflecting that he thus exposed his left wing to the different corps of the Dukes of Dalmatia, of Elchingen, and of Treviso, who had 70,000 men under arms. He has, it is true, drawn himself out of this critical situation, by a precipitate flight, and by abandoning his hospitals, his wounded, his horses, and a part of his equipages. It was thus that Gen. Moore, in his ridiculous expedition in the month of Nov. last, fled from Benevento to Corunna, abandoning his allies, his horses, his ammunition, and his equipages. Neither the one nor the other of these Generals has displayed that foresight, which is a characteristic so essential in war, and which prompts to do only what can be supported, and to undertake only what presents the greatest number of chances of success. Sir Arthur Wellesley has not evinced more talent than the men who direct the cabinet of St. James's. To wish to support Spain against France, and to contend upon the Continent with France, is forming an enterprize which will cost dear to those who have undertaken it, and who will meet in it only disasters. Conflagrations, it is true, may be kept up; misfortunes may be brought on peaceable inhabitants; rivers of blood may flow; the people, the protectors of whom they call themselves, may be ruined; but any other results are impossible.

The Moniteur of the 30th of September, contains an article extracted from an evening paper on the failure of our Expedition against Antwerp, in which it is said, that the Armistice concluded on the Danube, could not but have a powerful influence on the issue of that expedition, makes the following remarks on this assertion: "What a miserable excuse; what have the affairs of the Danube to do with the expedition of the Scheldt. Can it for a moment be supposed that France stood in need of the army which is in Vienna to defend herself against the English. The English expedition failed because it was extravagant; it would also have failed had the French been defeated at Wagram; nay, it would in that case have more certainly failed of success, because an unfortunate event would have doubled the energy of the French in the interior; it would have, because, in fact, fools only could attempt a similar expedition in a month, and a climate where epidemic fevers carry off one moiety of the army. Had it been undertaken in the month of May, the chances against its success would have been far less considerable; because at that time of the year no dread of maladies was to be entertained. The Cabinet of St. James's, acting in a different manner, displayed the utmost ignorance of circumstances, in a case to which it attached so much importance. The expedition was absurd; because Flushing could not be supposed to be taken but after a long siege, carried on in the midst of inundations; because after the reduction of Flushing it was necessary to direct further operations against Batz, Bergen-op-Zoom and Lillo; and because no attack on the strong place of Antwerp could be made but after previous sieges, to the number of three, which must take at least three months; and because it was not recollected that the fourth battalions of the regiments of all the army. which remain in France, form an army of more than a hundred thousand men, exclusively of the national guards and gens d'drmes of the neighbouring departments. In less than eight days a corps of 4,000 horse was assembled at Antwerp; while all the cavalry of Lord Chatham's army did not exceed 1,000.—Let not the English boast of their

holding the key of the Scheldt, they cannot hold it; any force which may be destined to defend that place must in the end be lost to England, either by capitulation or sickness, and in the former case we shall be more than indemnified for the loss of 4,000 men, who capitulated in Flushing, not 1,000 of whom were French.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Royal Order, directed to his Excellency the Marquis de Romana, and transmitted to him by Don Martin Garay, dated Badajoz, Aug.* 31.

In the midst of the great cares and attentions which the Supreme Governing Junta of the kingdom has taken, to follow with activity and firmness the defence of the country, it has never lost sight of the salutary reforms which the nation earnestly expects, which its actual situation requires, and which must be the foundation of its future prosperity. One of the greatest objects which now claim its attention, and which ought to occupy it with the greatest activity, is the convocation of the Cortes, the most important object which can, or ought, to employ the Supreme Junta. The more important this object is, the more necessary are the knowledge, the observations, and the experience of those who compose that assembly; and as, in a discussion of such magnitude, it will be expected by the nation, that all should concur, his majesty has been pleased to grant, that all the deputies shall give their assistance. It will therefore be necessary, in consequence of this sovereign and general determination, that the Marquis de Romana separate himself from his troops, and come to this city to exercise the functions of representative of the national body, though it is certainly most difficult to place at their head a Chief of equal experience and achievements; considering, however, the state of the kingdom of Gallicia, and the principality of Asturias, the Junta, after mature deliberation, has determined that the Marquis shall transfer his command to that General of his army whom he shall judge most capable.—I communicate to your excellency the order of his majesty, for its fulfilment, advising at the same time that the command of the army cannot with propriety be transferred to the major general the Conde de Noronha, because he being second Commandant-General in Gallicia, ought always to remain in that kingdom.

In consequence of this Royal Order, the Marquis de Romana has signified, that he has confided the command of the army to the major-gen. Don Gabriel de Mendezabal, and that of the kingdom, to the Conde de Noronha, second Commandant-General, and President of its Royal Audience.

Proclamation to the Army by the Marquis de Romana.

Soldiers!—The august voice of our sovereign, Ferdinand, reached our ears in Denmark, and we obeyed the call. Our country invoked our aid, and a generous nation, traversing stormy seas, conducted us to join our valiant countrymen, from whom we had been separated by the atrocious perfidy and vile prostitution of an individual. You have resisted the mortal blows aimed at you by the tyrant Napoleon, to destroy you. You have suffered with me the disasters which his unequalled force has spread through the whole nation, and though all Europe; but you, without other assistance than your own valour—without other arms than those furnished by nature—without other ammunition than your own inimitable constancy—without other stimuli than your own heroic patriotism—without other ambition than that inspired by your honour and fidelity; have disputed the first fruits of his triumph; and have raised your names to a level with those of the men who have been born to inspire admiration.—Gallicia is covered with French carcasses: neither ancient Carthage, nor modern France, can compare their marches with those incessant ones, which, during six months of want and privation, you have made among the impenetrable Alps of Castile, Gallicia, and the Asturias, in the most exposed and rigorous situations. Immortal warriors! without great and signal battles, you have annihilated the proud army of the tyrant, by aiding the national patriotism, supporting the noble fermentation, harassing the troops of the enemy, defeating them in small skirmishes, and reducing their possession to the ground on which they stand; you have fulfilled the most elevated obligations of the soldier, and the fatigues and cares which I, as your general, have undergone for your sakes, are the reward I owe you. *(To be continued.)*

LONDON:—Printed by T. C. HANSARD, Peterborough-Court, Fleet-Street;
Published by R. BAGSHAW, Brydges-Street, Covent-Garden:—Sold also by J. BUDD, Pall-Mall.